I. Introduction

Licensing ellipsis. Implicit material in VP ellipsis Δ argued to be recovered by various mechanisms: syntactic identity, semantic identity, discourse, and combinations of the above.

(1) a. John met Sue, and Mary did Δ met Sue, too.

b. Sue was met by John, and Mary was Δ met by John, too.

Voice mismatch asymmetry. Voice (Active, Passive) mismatches selectively tolerated: Passive-Active mismatches more acceptable than Active-Passive mismatches.[1, 2, 3]

(2) a. John met Sue, and Mary did Δ was met by Sue.

b. Sue was met by John, and Mary was Δ was met by John, too.

Retrieval accounts.

- **Voice match**: Syntactically identical antecedent retrieved, licensing standard ellipsis.
- **Voice mismatch**: Syntactic form of passive misremembered or misretrieved as active, resulting in occasional grammatical illusion.[2, 4]

II. Competition-based account

Inspired by ACT-R architecture[3]

- Lexical items spread activation to items of the same form, including homophonous Active-Passive forms
- Unencountered Active or Passive forms receive spreading activation when Passive or Active forms are accessed
- But Actives have a higher base activation than Passives due to increased base frequency, accounting for asymmetry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active/Passive</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John met Sue</td>
<td>Active John found Mary, and then Peter Passive Frank was driven by Abby, and then Sloan</td>
<td>Passive Mary was found by John, and then Peter Passive Frank was driven by Abby, and then Sloan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voice morphology: Misretrieval of VP depends on morphological form.

- **Novel prediction**: Passives with different forms than Actives (was driven – drove) spread no/less activation to Actives, hence less facilitation for Passive-Active VPE than those with the same form (was met – met).

III. Materials and predictions

Materials. 24 quartets crossed Antecedent Voice type (Active/Passive) with Match (Same/Different).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morph</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Mismatch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>John found Mary, and then Peter Passive Frank was driven by Abby, and then Sloan</td>
<td>did too was too</td>
<td>did too was too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Mary was found by John, and then Peter Passive Frank was driven by Abby, and then Sloan</td>
<td>did too was too</td>
<td>did too was too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Experiment 1: Acceptability ratings

24 native English speakers from UCLA rated sentences for acceptability on a Likert scale (7 = Completely acceptable). All subjects passed catch item controls.

- **Acceptability ratings**

V. Experiment 2: RSVP Speeded grammaticality

64 native English speakers from UCLA scoring over 70% on unrelated filler items. 2AFC Speeded acceptability study. Results analyzed as ex-Gaussian Bayesian models.

- **Percent accepted**
- **Reaction times**

VI. Conclusions and further questions

- Support for novel prediction that Voice Mismatch Asymmetry restricted to cases where the Active and Passives share morphological form:
  - Exp 1. Asymmetry disappears in acceptability ratings when Passive and Active forms are distinct;
  - Exp 2. Shorter RTs for Passive Match case when morphological form is distinct from Actives – suggesting that there is decreased lexical competition from more frequent Actives, which speeds time to decision
- Effects of discourse coherence might also be limited to/modulated by morphology?
- Modeling effects directly within ACT-R model?
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